

4-1-2014

Cross-Institutional and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on Curriculum for Global Engagement: Emerging Perspectives and Concerns

Fay Patel Ph.D.

Bond University, fpatel@bond.edu.au

Mingsheng Li Ph.D.

Massey University, m.s.li@massey.nz.ac

Matthew Piscioneri Ph.D.

Monash University, matthew.piscioneri@monash.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/jigs>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#), [Environmental Studies Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patel, Fay Ph.D.; Li, Mingsheng Ph.D.; and Piscioneri, Matthew Ph.D. (2014) "Cross-Institutional and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on Curriculum for Global Engagement: Emerging Perspectives and Concerns," *Journal of International and Global Studies*: Vol. 5: No. 2, Article 3.

DOI: 10.62608/2158-0669.1188

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/jigs/vol5/iss2/3>

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of International and Global Studies by an authorized editor of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

Cross-Institutional and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on Curriculum for Global Engagement:
Emerging Perspectives and Concerns¹

Fay Patel PhD
Bond University
fpatel@bond.edu.au

Mingsheng Li PhD
Massey University
m.s.li@massey.nz.ac

Matthew Piscioneri PhD
Monash University
matthew.piscioneri@monash.edu

Abstract

Inviting stakeholders to engage in dialogue on a curriculum for global engagement and organizational social responsibility in higher education (HE) is a challenge, especially when one crosses disciplinary and institutional boundaries. The established discourse and practice of internationalization in higher education over the past decades has manifested unresolved tensions and inconsistencies that have restricted the effective conceptualization of the global engagement curriculum. Upon observing inadequate professional development opportunities for dialogue regarding the global engagement curriculum at their respective universities, colleagues from Monash University and Deakin University in Australia and Massey University in New Zealand organized an open forum on the topic. This cross-institutional, interdisciplinary professional development forum on global engagement in an Australasian context was held in February 2013. The diverse perspectives and concerns that emerged during the forum on the impact of a global engagement curriculum on learning and teaching have been critically reviewed within this theoretically framed discussion paper.

Global engagement in current higher education (HE) agendas within Australia (and overseas) has multiple applications and is typically located as one part of a more general strategy to internationalization. The terms “global engagement” and “global citizenship” are often used interchangeably and may refer to the goals of internationalization with respect to (a) the recruitment of international students at HE institutions or (b) the preparation of domestic students for work and life in an international, global economy. Often, the emphasis in these discussions is on “engagement” itself (Engagement Australia, 2013), which is broadly defined as “multifaceted interactions between organizations and the diverse communities whom they serve.” The University of Melbourne (2013) in Australia defines engagement as “a term that describes many dimensions of interaction between academia and the wider society” and global engagement as aiming at “global excellence, relevance, and impact,” while Monash University is committed to maintaining “an international presence and global outlook,” and *Engagement Australia*’s primary focus is on “university-community engagement in Australia” (Engagement Australia, 2013). A review of institutional websites has suggested that higher education institution profiles have been increasingly blotted with vision statements and goal statements aimed at increasing global engagement. Indeed, under the umbrella term “engagement,” appear references to academic mobility, cultural engagement, and global research partnerships. However, there has been less evidence of actual engagement and, more specifically, little evidence of global engagement having been officially incorporated among core mainstream curriculum perspectives.

Elsewhere, in HE contexts similar to Australia, an almost identical lack of clarity regarding the focus of institutions’ commitments to global engagement is discernible, though older models of internationalization that emphasize global partnerships are visible on several websites, including that of Victoria University in Wellington (2013), New Zealand, for example, an institution that is explicitly committed to international engagement within a global partnership internationalization model. Uniquely, at the US Pennsylvania State University (2013), there is one approach that acknowledges a global engagement curriculum perspective—one that is connected to the university’s Global Engagement Fund. This fund offers grants for a variety of global engagement activities. The grants include the development of “interdisciplinary courses and projects” that engage young researchers in undergraduate research projects as well as collaborative faculty research ventures and conferences and international partnerships. The Penn State model can be regarded as an enabling model in that it encourages global engagement that invests in learning, teaching, and global community building across a range of academic global engagement activities. By implementing such an enabling model, the institution has set a precedent in establishing an organizational social responsibility ethic to ensure that university policy and practice (in this case, funding policy) has been established as a responsive, proactive measure to support global engagement initiatives within the organization. Institutions are encouraged to embed organizational social responsibility strategies that proactively promote an enabling organizational culture through an equitable distribution of the institutional budget.

In the following sections, a brief review is presented of the global engagement paradigm. Next, the discussion concentrates on the perceived impact of the global engagement paradigm on learning and teaching as related to curriculum design, implementation, and resources. Reference is made to earlier internationalization discourse as a disengaging model that has negatively affected academic progress. Finally, the paper presents and reviews the 2013 cross-institutional, interdisciplinary professional development forum on global engagement conducted with the participation of three Australasian universities. This theoretical review of global engagement embedded within an organizational social responsibility framework also discusses emerging perspectives and concerns within the realm of global engagement.

Global Engagement

The focus on global engagement among Australian institutions of higher education is aligned with the Australian Federal Government's push to build the nation's economy and maintain a strong Australian presence in the Asian Pacific economy. In order to compete and lead in that economy, Australia must increase the skills and competencies of its citizenry so that graduates can lead Australia into what was described in the Government's White Paper as the "Asian Century", that is the dominance of Asian economies and perhaps even cultures as the 21st Century unfolds (Australian Government, 2013). Australian institutions have responded to this federal push by embracing engagement and global engagement as a means of attracting the next generation of globally engaged graduates. The next section elaborates on the complexities and opportunities for Australia to compete in the "Asian Century."

Australia in the "Asian Century"

The first years of the twentieth century (1900 -1914) were said to represent an "Awakening of Asia" (Romein, 1962, p.39) or an "age of self-consciousness." According to Romein (1962), in this era of Asia's "awakening, countries in Asia began seeking autonomy and empowerment in governance and leadership. Over a century later, at the start of the twenty first century, the projected dominance of Asia within the global economy has resulted in the notion of an "Asian Century," during which Asia is expected to continue to assert its economic prowess, in particular.

Evans (2011, p.1) recognizes China's and India's emergence as economic powerhouses over the course of the last two decades, with their combined economies having gone "from [constituting] less than a tenth of the global economy to almost a fifth" and being "projected to grow from a fifth to a third" of the global economy over the course of the next two decades. In addition to Asia's political and economic power, the region also demonstrates considerable authority in the fields of science and education. As such, Asia's global power has resulted in a shifting of the global engagement goal posts in a decidedly south-easterly direction. Indeed, according to the *Australian Academy of Science* (AAS), "the global scientific landscape is rapidly developing, with the balance of power moving East and South" (2011, p.1). The AAS is also specifically concerned with the implications of decisions made within higher education relating to science and innovation collaboration, particularly decisions that pertain to "education standards"—as "high standards in education [are] crucial for competitiveness in the global knowledge economy" (p.11). In its 2011 paper, the organization explicitly called for the creation of "opportunities for international experience and network-building" for Australian students so that they may "contribute and compete in the 21st century"; it also advocated linking international research policy with postgraduate opportunities and investment in early and mid-career opportunities.²

While recognizing the important critical discourse of the "Asian Century" rhetoric (Pan, 2013), it would be dismissive not to simultaneously acknowledge the changes in the economic balance of power that have taken place *within* the region³ and the global impacts these realignments are having, particularly on higher education, at both the regional and global levels. For Australia, negotiating a place within the Australasian landscape during this rebalancing of power means seeking and taking advantage of opportunities that will feed and boost the Australian economy.⁴ It is this thrust that creates within Australian higher education the incentive to approach global engagement as a means of fuelling the nation's economy and also as a means of educating a sustainable global citizenry. If Australia is committed to enhancing its competitiveness and productivity in the global economy in the

Asian Century, there must be an increased focus on generating a citizenry with the skills and knowledge necessary to excel and compete in an authentically global economy. In order to respond to and meet national needs, Australia must continue to invest strongly and strategically in quality higher education to produce suitably qualified graduates.⁵ As such, Australian political agendas and national higher education frameworks should align closely with national aspirations. Likewise, national goals of economic investment should connect significantly with academic program design and delivery, research goals, institutional marketing and recruitment campaigns, and transnational partnerships within the Asia–Pacific region and globally. Like other developed countries, especially those within the Asia-Pacific Region, Australia is compelled to heed such recommendations with respect to its higher education sector if it intends to remain an active and key stakeholder in the 21st century.

Moving Past Problematic Internationalization Discourse

Among the challenges facing HE institutions in the implementation of recent global engagement initiatives is the challenge of moving beyond earlier understandings or interpretations of internationalization and the discourse associated earlier implementation strategies. Specifically, the original internationalization framework did not adequately embrace a holistic, collaborative perspective aimed at aligning the efforts of institutional student services, marketing initiatives, and curriculum design or include the goal of implementing internationalization as a mainstream theme across academic disciplines. As such, early incarnations of internationalization efforts were marginalized within particular programs and, ultimately, resulted not in internationalized curricula but rather in a focus on the internationalization of the student body and international student recruitment (and the subsequent development of English as a Second Language programs and concern with assimilating foreign students into an Australian national culture). Within this discussion paper, the authors disassociate the current focus on global engagement from the earlier internationalization framework and seek to shift the notion and practice of global engagement from marginal contexts to a central space within the mainstream in higher education in a holistic, connected framework.

Problems with Global Engagement in Higher Education

Despite the need for opportunities that foster global engagement among student populations, visions for achieving such global engagement do not always coincide with institutional agendas. Visions and goals in global engagement promote collaborative research and development opportunities with global partners; however, organizational social responsibility strategies to promote such collaborative efforts are often absent from institutional agendas (which primarily serve to enable institutional constituents, both within academic programs and student services). This results in a major challenge in embedding global engagement opportunities in academic programs and student services at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels and often increases tensions between academic programs and student services, which must typically compete and bid for funding. It is both earlier variations of internationalization discourse (which included less holistic, less collaborative parameters), along with some of the limiting policies and practices in HE contexts that may in part be responsible for the current tensions underlying the global engagement dialogue.

In addition to managing underlying tensions with respect to implementing visions for global engagement, HE institutions must also often simultaneously manage reductions in

state funding that require them to seek alternative revenue streams. Western institutions have turned to the recruitment of international students to expand their revenues. The resulting discourse surrounding the “marketization” of higher education for the purposes of recruiting international students prevails in many Western higher institutions, and institutional objectives regarding the recruitment of international students have even begun to dictate pedagogic practices, reflecting the “inherent dangers of ... curriculum commodification associated with [such] discourse” (De Vita, 2003, p. 384). Consequently, in the universities pursuing international applicants as a means of increasing revenue, the adoption of qualitative, authentic internationalization of curricula is sometimes more rhetoric than reality (Reid & Spencer-Oatey, 2013). Indeed, the practice of marketing academic programs as part of recruitment efforts without an understanding of “internationalization” as an academic objective in and of itself demonstrates the disjuncture between the different institutional agendas and policies on global engagement.

In addition to the conflicting objectives of various parties on campus regarding the “internationalization” of the institutions, of further concern are the ways in which global engagement themes are incorporated into the classroom, when such incorporation is attempted. Specifically, for example, simply adding or “sprinkling in” some international perspectives to courses that are basically the cultural products of local culture may seem to “make [various programs] more attractive to a wide range of potential customers” (De Vita, 2003, p. 387); however, this is not akin to authentic incorporation of global themes. Critically, says Marginson (2002, p. 22), universities that conceive foreign students as customers and operate on the basis of trade and business are run by “entrepreneurial presidents and marketing units—rather than by faculty.” It can also be the case that the faculty who must teach these programs do not have the ownership of the new programs sometimes developed in haste by the university (Marginson, 2002). In these cases, internationalization agendas in HE lack clearly defined learning and pedagogic objectives and learning outcomes. Additionally, not all academics are aware of the theoretical implications of the internationalization discourse, and many struggle to understand the meaning and the value of the concept (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2007). This is perhaps one reason why so much scholarly effort in HE internationalization studies has been expended on trying to grapple with an adequate, relatively functional definition of the concept of internationalizing higher education.

Although many universities claim to be international universities, at times, even at such institutions, there can appear to be little or no systematic planning and coordinated policy development with respect to internationalization objectives and no concerted effort made toward or shared understanding of a commitment to internationalization (Montgomery, 2013, p. 117). In terms of “internationalizing” curricula, it often remains up to the discretion of individual instructors how to do so. At times, the incorporation of international content is the result of trial and error—even perhaps a spur of the moment decision, or a pedagogic whim—rather than the systematic embedding of international perspectives in the curriculum, developed at the programmatic level. There is also an implicit assumption that the target population of an internationalized curricula is international students only (i.e. that curricula must be internationalized to “meet the needs” of foreign students). This is a misguided interpretation and portrays the international students themselves not as a valuable resource in the process of achieving global engagement but as a “problem” requiring that amendments be made to “otherwise satisfactory” curricula. Haigh (2008), for example, has claimed that universities, based on such an erroneous assumption, target the wrong audience (foreign students) in their efforts to internationalize. In reality, he says, it is the university’s domestic students who would most benefit from an internationalized curriculum, as many domestic students have limited knowledge of or exposure to non-local or non-Western culture. Indeed,

says Haigh (2008, p. 433), domestic students often “signal either ignorance or antipathy to ‘otherness,’” and would benefit immensely from a more internationalized world view. In comparison, many international students (by virtue of living or studying internationally themselves) already possess a more nuanced appreciation of global engagement.

Jackson and Huddart (2010) studied how Newcastle University local students (UK) responded to “internationalization.” In spite of Haigh’s (2008) insights indicated above, Jackson and Huddart’s study suggested there was a substantial gap between the university’s policy and practice: the surveyed students reported having little or no interest in internationalization and in international exposure. The university’s internationalization charter did not appear to influence students’ perceptions or decision-making, possibly because the framing of the charter did not connect with them at an appropriately articulated level. The surveyed students, who had very limited informal experiences with international students, reported that they would not consider gaining an international experience at the university, via interaction on-campus with students from outside of the United Kingdom, beneficial. Clearly, these students’ responses undermine the expectations embedded in the university’s internationalization charter.

In light of results such as these, this paper argues for is the importance of matching policy with practice by developing a curriculum that is both inclusive and transformative. Such a curriculum would benefit both domestic and international students and assist students in developing their cognitive and intercultural communication skills and capacities for cross-cultural communication, cultural tolerance, adaptation, flexibility, and empathy. In these ways, it would be anticipated that all students might cope more effectively and sensitively with cross-cultural issues in multicultural contexts, for example (Zezeza, 2012). A curriculum that promotes global engagement would also better challenge the hegemonic power of the prevalent mono-cultural model of teaching pedagogy, which unreflectively promotes ethnocentric views and “Western packaged global problems and seemingly global solution[s]” (Anyanwu, 1998, p. 18). Anglo-centric education promotes a mono-cultural global model that reinforces the existing cultural norms, conventions, established norms and practices, ignores the richness of cultural diversity and prevents the emergence of a dynamic and transformative internationalized curriculum (De Vita, 2003). Such an ethnocentric and Anglo-centric view “is often presented as if it were universal” in spite of the fact that an Anglo-centric education is often of little direct relevance to the international student (Ryan, 2000, p. 58). According to Yang, Li & Sligo (2008), as “customers” (a label that typically describes learners within a higher education marketing context), international students are often not satisfied with their learning experiences and feel that they have not received what they paid for—or, more accurately, what they were sold (namely, an “internationalized” education).

Impact on Learning and Teaching: Emerging Perspectives and Concerns

Several of the assumptions, misunderstandings and generalizations about global engagement have much to do with the legacy the term inherits from the internationalization discourse and practice. In this section, the discussion focuses on various emerging perspectives, along with concerns that may already exist within the internationalization approach. The point of discussion is to review emerging perspectives and to move past the old practices.

Pedagogic Challenges of the Global Engagement Curriculum

Effective global engagement curricula must be developed into degree programs to better prepare all students for life in an increasingly interdependent world (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2007). Curricular internationalization involves not only the students themselves (both domestic and international) but also lecturers, management, student learning support, student services, and pastoral care (i.e. the university as a whole) (Jackson & Huddart, 2010). Many challenges arise in introducing, developing and implementing authentically internationalized curricula. These challenges include (a) a lack of a clear understanding on the part of the university of the concept of internationalization itself, (b) the dominance of commercial interests over educational quality, (c) a gap between the development and implementation of a balanced curriculum for both domestic and international students, (d) the missing component of authentic faculty internationalization, and (e) the hegemonic influence of the mono-cultural model of teaching pedagogy.

Of these challenges, perhaps the most immediately problematic to the implementation of internationalized curricular content are those relating to faculty and their pedagogical approaches. Faculty internationalization must clearly precede curriculum internationalization (De Vita, 2003). However, in many institutions of higher education, the faculty are neither internationalized themselves nor necessarily equipped to fully internationalize their pedagogical approaches. While internationalization discourse was once considered to be sufficiently capable of motivating academics to change “the inflexible academic teaching and learning environment” (Faulkner, 2001, p. 475), it seems that even willing faculty members often struggle to implement internationalized curricula. Importantly, internationalizing the curriculum requires faculty to fully understand the value and theoretical implications of internationalization in the pedagogic practices and research orientations so that they can develop courses more relevant to students’ needs, interests, and expectations. While it was once anticipated that simple faculty internationalization would enable faculty members to become more reflective about how they teach, what they teach, how they assess learning outcomes, how they cater for individual and cultural differences, and how they develop a curriculum that is culturally fair and inclusive (De Vita, 2003), it appears as though more explicitly guided curricular development is necessary in order to assist faculty in the incorporation of the themes and concepts behind internationalization into curricular realities. According to Schuerholz-Lehr (2007, p. 8), in many universities and disciplines, “academics are untrained, unprepared, and disinterested in internationalization” and lack “international knowledge awareness and competence” to effectively implement internationalization into course themes. One reason, as presented by Schuerholz-Lehr, for faculty members’ apparent disinterest in and disengagement from an internationalization framework is that many faculty members themselves lack global literacy, making it difficult for them to sufficiently internalize and/or appreciate the concept and its implications. Perhaps, also of interest, a finding that impacts all stakeholders –students, faculty and professional staff -- Schuerholz-Lehr also found that at many universities, internationalization has not been part of the institutions’ imperatives or priorities. As such, not only is there a lack of “systemic and systematic planning and coordination” (p.9) with respect to the implementation of internationalized curricula, but the international collaborations developed by faculty as well as exemplary individual efforts by faculty in international education are also often not recognized, supported, or rewarded.

A second reason for lack of faculty engagement with internationalization may be that faculty members simply need to focus the majority of their time and energies elsewhere. Indeed, academics’ promotions are often based on their research outputs rather than on their pedagogic innovations or excellence in educational practices, which are largely subordinate

to economic priorities (Haigh, 2008). As such, faculty members' incentive to meaningfully transform curricula often takes a back seat to their need to focus their attention on research and publication. Despite the recent flurry of broadly communicated goals and vision statements regarding global engagement and internationalization among institutions of higher education, aspects of Shuerholz-Lehr's findings continue to be reflected in the disconnect between institutional statements and classroom deliverables.

In addition to faculty-specific issues that complicate the implementation of internationalized curricula is the equally problematic issue of overcoming pedagogical approaches that were not historically developed with an international or culturally heterogeneous audience in mind. According to Crossley and Watson (2003), most Western curricula are imbued with national tradition, culture, literature, and local knowledge and conventions that are designed for domestic students and largely irrelevant to the needs of international students. In such a learning environment, international students and non-traditional students can be disadvantaged because of their learning styles, languages, cultures, and previous educational experiences. As such, there are significant pedagogic challenges inherent to the promotion, design, and implementation of a global engagement perspective within a mainstream curriculum.

Impact of Global Engagement on Instructors at Faculty Level and Teaching

Instructors who do attempt to incorporate themes of internationalization within tertiary curricula face dilemmas in making critical professional decisions in identifying suitable learning activities, resources, and opportunities to engage learners with the type of content that will prepare these learners for their place within a global citizenry. Instructors must also identify and create fair and relevant assessments and design learning tasks that will facilitate shared values and visions among students and encourage them to participate within a collaborative, global engagement framework. Finally, professors and/or instructors (and teaching roles) are directly affected not only by the range of diversity among instructors and learners but also by the instructors' own global mobility, academic expertise in global research, interrogation and understanding of the instructors' own stereotypes and prejudices, and the underlying moral imperatives of global engagement. Indeed, among the challenges facing instructors in their attempt to internationalize classroom content and instructional approaches is that of teaching a culturally diverse student population when the instructors themselves are products of mono-cultural populations, making it difficult – though not impossible, admittedly -- to provide pedagogic instruction that takes multicultural perspectives into consideration

The list below (compiled from the literature and anecdotal evidence) identifies several perceived areas of impact on instructors with respect to the challenges and/or obstacles that often complicate efforts to internationalize pedagogical approaches and classroom instruction.

- Inadequate interest of interdisciplinary teams.
- Restrictive promotion and research policy and practice within HE institutions (Haigh, 2008).
- Inconsistent application of internationalization on an institutional level (Debowski, 2003).
- Excessive difficulty designing and implementing international curricula due to their requiring the integration of multiple resources.

- Excessive complexity inherent to developing learning and teaching approaches within a global community building framework (Patel et al., 2011).
- Apparent difficulty in providing quality assurance of curriculum and assessment design.
- Widespread lack of funding to support implementation at the regional, national, and transnational levels.
- Limited mobility of teachers and learners.

Two other issues also relate to this complex range of challenges that seem to resist successful implementation of institutionally envisaged programs of internationalization:

- Lack of professional development in international perspective engagement.
- Instructors' limited knowledge of diversity of international cohorts (e.g. language, perspectives, approaches to learning, etc.).

These two issues have not been introduced at any great length in the essay given the limited scope of the discussion, but, certainly, they invite ongoing examination and research. In the next discussion, one recent effort that attempted to practically respond to some of the issues raised above is examined.

Forum on Global Engagement: Rationale and Context

The rationale for organizing a forum on global engagement was grounded within the cross-institutional visions and missions of the University of Melbourne, Deakin University, and Massey University to focus on global engagement as a priority. In researching the practices of their respective institutions, colleagues at all three institutions found that although the institutions had embraced global engagement goals, institutional staff had few opportunities to engage in dialogue on global engagement or to clarify their diverse notions and understandings of global engagement. Additionally, based on observed patterns of communication and a review of institutional policy and practice at all three universities, concerns relating to the differences between the objectives of various parties with respect to global engagement activities (e.g. marketing, recruitment, student learning services and academic offerings) were noted. For instance, it was noted that academics typically went about their teaching and learning curriculum review and design with little or no involvement at any level from the areas of marketing and public relations or academic mobility office.⁶ It appeared that the entrenched divisions between academic and professional services offices (and even within professional service divisions) posed an obstacle to achieving the sort of synergies and cross-fertilization of ideas and sharing of strategies regarding global engagement that would enhance the quality of global engagement partnerships. As such, the forum was conceived as an opportunity to bridge some of these existing gaps and serve as the first cross-institutional and interdisciplinary forum to explore global engagement within a collegial, professional development context. The forum was conducted in February of 2013.

Discussion

The legacy of the rhetoric associated with earlier incarnations of internationalization practice still somewhat overshadows the current dialogue on global engagement and current references to internationalization. As such, it is necessary to distinguish between the two conceptual frameworks of internationalization and global engagement and to ensure that the new global engagement framework is specifically designed and implemented within an organizational social responsibility framework and does not repeat the mistakes made under the umbrella of “internationalization” as it was previously conceived.

Evidence of a desire for a shift in practice from internationalization (i.e. of the student population) to the incorporation of an educational focus on global engagement as an inclusive, diverse, and equitable framework was noted at the open forum on global engagement coordinated by the authors. The open forum on global engagement introduced a framework for global engagement that went beyond the academic or learning-related dimensions of incorporating the theme into the HE context to include the affective, psychomotor, and moral dimensions. The affective domain of Bloom’s (1956) Taxonomy of Learning Domains refers to the emotions (expressions of feelings and attitudes, for example) whereas the psychomotor domain refers to the physical mannerisms in which learners engage with their learning. The moral dimension is an extension of the affective manner in which learners demonstrate their understanding of ethical behaviours based on deeply held values.

The forum was committed to inclusivity among participants and aimed to bridge the long standing division among academic teaching staff and professional services staff (student admissions, services, recruitment and marketing). In particular, what the convenors of the symposium attempted to achieve was to give *substance* to the current rhetoric in university “management-speak”, for example, about collapsing restrictive “silos” that hamper the smooth and ideally productive exchange of information. We recognize it was an initial attempt at bringing to partial fruition a model that could provide useful to future efforts to implement or address these key themes. Particular effort was expended to diversify the focus of the proceedings. A strictly “academic” focus on issues connected to global engagement was avoided, and contributions from complementary areas of the university and diverse interest groups were encouraged. For example, issues related to challenges in the successful implementation of an internationalized curriculum, the management of student mobility programs, central issues in contemporary academic mobility theory and practice (sometimes less of a concern in terms of purely academic research in the field of either internationalization or global engagement), were all broached. In addition, the Keynote address focused on discussion of the potential internationalizing impacts on global higher education of MOOCs (*massive open online courses*).

As a result of the forum’s inclusion of such a broad range of participants and parties (each with their own objectives and goals), a number of the discussions and exchanges among presenters and participants was particularly tense, and an institutional “clash of cultures” was disclosed. Despite such tensions, it was concluded that one way to move forward with the implementation of global engagement despite the various objectives of different parties within HE is to adopt and establish intra-organizational partnerships among those responsible for the academic design and delivery of global engagement themes and those who promote institutional learning services. Bridging the gap between the offices that see “global engagement” and “internationalization” as primarily a sort of recruitment goal, on the one hand, and the academic parties that see global engagement and internationalization as pedagogically relevant themes that should reflect institutional values and visions that are committed to organizational social responsibility, on the other hand, requires a re-alignment of purpose on the part of all parties. Higher education institutions must combine their

academic and institutional services global engagement agendas to ensure that quality academic programs are offered as part of the institutions' collective vision. Institutions are responsible for and accountable to their local and regional constituencies for their actions as well as to the global communities from which they recruit students.

Conclusion

Commitment to a holistic perspective on global engagement within higher education contexts is an imperative. The global engagement framework that is proposed in this paper subscribes to an "embedded model" of global engagement that connects all academic learning goals and visions with the goals of institutional learning services. A collective effort to infuse global engagement initiatives with academic rigor and learning design initiatives to incorporate learning services perspectives and practical applications of real world learning is advocated. The cross-institutional and interdisciplinary professional development forum created open spaces for dialogue on global engagement among professionals whose work and collective visions intersect. Of course, the open dialogue forum also brought to the fore much of the rhetoric, tension, and parochial perspectives related to past and current internationalization practice. Nonetheless, the discoveries made during the forum serve as important scaffolds for clarifying the misunderstandings and assumptions of the various entities across HE institutions involved in the forum so that the organizations can move forward and proactively develop holistic higher education organizational frameworks that are socially responsible and just.

Global engagement initiatives in Australian higher education are expected to take cognizance of Australia's role in and response to the Asian Century discourse because Australia's future economic sustainability is intricately tied to that of her neighbours in the greater Asian continent. A curriculum for global engagement (the "global engagement curriculum") will promote a higher education model that enables learners, through various collective academic and student services initiatives and partnerships, to prepare for participation in the global citizenry. Global engagement fosters values and behaviors that will encourage the global citizenry to appreciate and acknowledge its collective humanity.

¹ The authors acknowledge the grant from the Monash University Learning and Teaching Fellowship and the generous in kind contributions of Monash University and Deakin University in hosting two cross-institutional symposiums on global engagement and citizenship in February and September 2013.

² Australia is not alone in its quest to link global economic aspirations with the internationalization and preparation of its workforce. As noted on the United States Department of Education 2013 Higher Education Programs website, "education is not only an economic necessity for the nation, but a moral imperative" (Higher Education Program Meetings, 2013).

³ Evans (2011, p.4) contends that within the first 14 years of the 21st century alone, Asian powers have already contested their historical places within the Asian economy, with China overtaking Japan in 2010 "to become the world's second largest economy."

⁴ As noted in the AAS Position paper (2011, p.1), Australia is struggling to balance her global engagement agenda between the Asian tectonic forces and the need to reaffirm her allied relationship with the North: "A decade into the "Asian Century," Australia increasingly seeks to improve its links with its Asian neighbors, while maintaining and strengthening links with North America and Europe."

⁵ The AAS (2011, p. 10) identifies critical national research and development needs "in areas such as sustainable agriculture, water resources management and renewable energy."

⁶ There may be some reference group initiatives for services staff (library, student services, academic skills), for example at Deakin University, to advise on learning design.

References

- Anyanwu, C. (1998). *Is internationalisation in the classroom a reverse discrimination on Australian students?* Paper presented at the Teaching and learning in changing times: Proceedings of the 7th Annual Teaching Learning Forum, Perth.
- Arbor, R., & Blackmore, J. (2010). The impact of fee-paying international students on Australian secondary schools, teachers and students. Retrieved from <http://www.deakin.edu.au/arts-ed/efi/pubs/impact-internationalisation-schools-arber-blackmore.pdf>
- Australian Academy of Science. (2011). Australian science in a changing world: Innovation requires global engagement – Position Paper. Canberra: Australian Academy of Science Retrieved from <http://www.science.org.au/reports/documents/Innovationrequiresglobalengagement.pdf>
- Australian Government, (2013). Australia in the Asian Century. Retrieved from <http://asiancentury.dpmc.gov.au/>
- Bloom B. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co Inc.
- Crossley, M., & Watson, K. (2003). *Comparative and international research in education: Globalization, context and difference*. London: Routledge.
- Debowski, S. (2003) Lost in internationalised space: the challenge of sustaining academics teaching offshore. In the *Proceedings of Securing the future for international education: Managing growth and diversity*. 17th IDP Australian International Education Conference. 21 – 24 October, 2003, Melbourne, Victoria. Retrieved from http://www.aiec.idp.com/pdf/debowskifri0900_p.pdf
- De Vita, G. (2003). Rethinking the internationalisation agenda in UK higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27(4), 383-398.
- Devlin-Foltz, B. & MacIlvaine, S. (2008). Teacher preparation for the global age: The imperative for change. Retrieved on 16 February 2013 from <http://www.longviewfdn.org/files/44.pdf>
- Engagement Australia. (2013). Engagement Australia. Retrieved on 8 February 2013 from <http://engagementaustralia.org.au/>
- Evans, G. (2011). India and Australia in the Asian Century. .Australia India Institute and University of Calcutta Conference: *The Asian Century – Security, Sustainability and Society: An India Australia Dialogue*, Kolkata, 5 December 2011. Retrived from <http://www.gevans.org/speeches/speech460.html>
- Faulkner, V. (2001). Making multicultural education "real." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6, 473-485.
- Haigh, M. (2008). Internationalisation, planetary citizenship and Higher Education Inc. *Compare*, 38(4), 427-440.
- Higher Education Program Meetings. (2013). FY 2013 HEP Project Directors' Meeting. Retrieved from <https://hepmeetings.com/about>
- Jackson, E., & Huddart, T. (2010). *Understanding internationalisation of home students for improvements to curriculum design*. Paper presented at the Bristol Residential Learning to Learn, Bristol, 21-22 January.
- Marginson, S. (2002). Education in the global market: Lessons from Australia. *Academe Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, 88(3), 22.
- Monash University. (2013). International Engagement. Retrieved from <http://www.monash.edu.au/international/>

- Montgomery, C. (2013). A future curriculum for future graduates? Rethinking a higher education curriculum for a globalised world. In J. Ryan (Ed.), *Cross-cultural teaching and learning for home and international students* (pp. 171-181). London: Routledge.
- Pan, C. (2013). The Asian/Chinese Century from the Chinese perspective. *Griffith Asia Quarterly* 1(1), 30-52.
- Patel, F., Li, M., & Sooknanan, P. (July 2011) *Intercultural communication: Building a global community*. Delhi, India: Sage Publications.
- Patel, F., Sooknanan, P., Rampersad, G. & Mundkur, A. (2012). *Information technology, development and social change*. New York: Routledge
- Peterson, J., Lee, O., Islam, T., & Piscioneri, M. (2012.) *Effectively implementing information communication technology in higher education in the Asia-Pacific region*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Reid, S., & Spencer-Oatey, H. (2013). Towards the global citizen: Utilizing a competency framework to promote intercultural knowledge and skills in higher education students. In J. Ryan (Ed.), *Cross-cultural teaching and learning for home and international students* (pp. 125-140). London: Routledge.
- Romein, J. (1962). *The Asian Century: The history of modern nationalism in Asia*. London: Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Ryan, J. (2000). *A guide to teaching international students*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S. (2007). Teaching for global literacy in higher education: how prepared are the educators? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(2), 180-204.
- University of Melbourne. (2013). Global Engagement. Retrieved from <http://engage.unimelb.edu.au/global-engagement>
- University of Pennsylvania. (2013). Global Engagement Fund. Retrieved from <http://global.upenn.edu/gef>
- Victoria University of Wellington. (2013). International Engagement. Retrieved from <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/international/engagement/index.aspx>
- Yang, Y., Li, M., & Sligo, F. (2008). Chinese students' satisfaction levels with their learning experiences in New Zealand. Refereed paper presented to the Australian and New Zealand Communication Association (ANZCA) Conference 2008: *Power and Place*, Wellington, July 9-11, 2008.
- Zezeza, P. T. (2012). Internationalization in higher education: opportunities and challenges for the knowledge project in the global south. In P. Kotecha (Ed.), *Internationalization in higher education: perspectives from the global south* (pp. 4-27). South Africa: Southern African Regional Universities Association.